

P. C. ADVERTISER --- SUPPLEMENT

HONOLULU, HAWAIIAN ISLANDS, SATURDAY, JANUARY 28, 1882.

Legislative Debate in 1878.

[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 3.]

His Excellency the Attorney-General said: Whenever His Majesty desires me to resign my commission, I shall do so most cheerfully; but I do not intend to do this at the bidding of the Hon. member from Lahaina (Mr. Gibson.) As I have never sought office or allowed others to seek it for me here, although the Hon. member from Lahaina stated here that I always pursued office, so shall I most willingly return to private life at any time when the authority under which I hold shall so desire. I am convinced that the only ground for the present resolution is purely on personal grounds—on motives not looking to public interest. The Hon. member from Lahaina has referred to his own course in this country, and says that he has always sought only the good of the people here. I do not care to open the volume of the Hon. member's history, both before he came to this country and since; but it is well known, and there are natives on this island, on Kauai, and perhaps on Lanai, if they still live, who could tell how the Hon. member has looked after their interests. Stanch old Nahoelua, if living, could tell of the Hon. member's treatment of natives. But I prefer to avoid personal allusions, although they are fairly invited by the comparison he has sought to make with himself.

Honorable Mr. Bickerton said: "There seems to be some misunderstanding about the reference to the appropriation bill in the resolution. One member has said that it means the indefinite postponement of the bill. It is a mistake; it is only the postponement of the appropriation bill, we having no confidence in the present Ministry. The Hon. Noble Mr. Rhodes has made some strong arguments why we should not feel confidence in the present Ministry, stronger than any I have heard yet; yet he does not feel that he can vote for the resolution. Of course all men have different opinions, and I do, and shall always respect his, but I can't agree with him this time; he has also said a good deal about the annexation party, that former Ministers belonged to it, that there was something behind these Ministries, that this Ministry was chosen from the same party; he wished that some other party may be in power; he has also said he is glad to see that an opposition party has been formed that has strength, and that it is not as it has been in former sessions, that members could be bought up by government appointments; it used to be that after the close of the session that a great many of the Representatives figured as Tax Assessors or Tax Collectors; he now thought there was some hope for Hawaii. I agree with him, and I laud him for saying so. Now the Minister of Interior says a great deal about this resolution being floating about for days; who has brought it on, have they not? They threw down the gauntlet and challenged us and we have taken it up, they asked us to come on, and we have done so. If I had any doubts about this resolution they were all dispelled yesterday; that letter was enough for me. The Minister of Foreign Relations should have simply told the House that it was not considered proper by the Ministry that Mr. Carter should come on the floor of this House and speak, he not being a member, and that it was interfering with the King's prerogative, and that he did not wish it; and not have brought the King's autograph letter here and had read it. It was dragging the King before this House and laying him open to criticism. This should never be. The Attorney-General has said that he knew nothing of this letter being read in the House until he saw it here. How is this? Do these four Ministers act in such an important matter as this without consulting together on (as the Hon. Noble Mr. Rhodes has said), 'The most serious and important thing that these Ministers have to answer for?' Yes, Mr. Chairman, can we have confidence in such a Ministry? A great deal has been said about the baby (the resolution) and my friends the Hon. Mr. Gibson and the Hon. Noble Mr. Kaai, have been called the fathers of it by the Minister of the Interior. I never knew of a child having two fathers, so I never said myself to the number. I have been called by many one of the leaders of the independent party, so I presume I am an uncle, and I think that baby will find many uncles among the members of this House. If it is so I am proud of it; I am proud to be considered an independent member. I promised my constituents this; I have no offices to offer or money to give for bribes, so if I have led any member or members of this House, I have not done it with money or promise of office. I could not expect my constituents to say that I was a good and faithful servant, if by my vote I said I had confidence in the present Ministry as a body. How can any independent member of this House say he has confidence, after the developments that have been made since the opening of this session? Look at the report of the Finance Committee and the report of the Experts, and the result of the vote on the adoption thereof. That vote was the voice of the people; the Representatives are the voice of the people; and some of the Nobles also voted for the adoption of those reports.

The Attorney-General this morning has spoken of members speaking of motives of others, and throwing out insinuations. His speeches all through this session have been full of such things; they have teemed with insinuations as to motives of others; he should have been the last one to speak of it.

His Excellency the Minister of the Interior said: At this late hour, and when every member has made up his mind as to what he will vote, it may be useless for me to speak further, but when I find the opposition to the Ministry reduced to the gratification of personal ambition, I cannot refrain from making a few remarks. I am surprised to find the entire people represented by the Hon. member from Lahaina (Mr. Gibson) and the Hon. member from Hamakua, and that the King and Nobles have not any voice in the Government. The interests of the Kingdom are in the keeping of the King, Nobles

and Representatives. Long as I have lived here, and served in public capacities, I now find myself for the first time in antagonism to the people, according to the remarks of the Hon. member from Hamakua. Did the gentleman who represents the district of Hamakua go into it? Not one out of every ten know him by name. Was he elected on any platform? He never made a speech in his district, or wrote an article for publication in the newspapers, or said a word about his principles until he got here.

Mr. Bickerton said he had a circular printed and circulated in the district.

His Excellency the Minister of the Interior—Did he print that he would oppose the King and his Ministers? If he had, we never would have seen his beautiful presence in this House. The independent party he speaks of is not known among the people. It exists only in this House, championed only by those who lust for office, and desire to oust the present Ministry. The Hon. member for North Kona did have a platform; he is honest and able, and talks to-day as he did to his constituents. There has not appeared any sign of discontent with the King or Ministry except from a few members of this House. And the Hon. member from Lahaina (Mr. Gibson) and the Hon. member from Hamakua (Mr. Bickerton), instead of serving well their constituents, are betraying them and their country. The Hon. member for Honolulu said he had confidence in the Minister of Finance, but not the other three. Then why censure him? A man who through merit has arisen to a high position among his people, commanding their respect, your course toward him astonishes me. The Ministry is frequently benefited by the advice of the Judges of the Supreme Court, and it may be better for the Hon. member to profit by it than follow the leadership of intriguing persons who hope to make a little credit or something else out of the proceeding. I don't cast any opprobrium on the native Representatives, I honor them, but regret that they allow themselves to be led by false lights; for, in so doing, they injure the Hawaiian people and their Government. Had it not been for the friendship and personal exertions of a native gentleman the Hon. member from Lahaina (Mr. Gibson) would never have arrived here. What measure of importance has he introduced? Look at the island of Lanai, look at its history for the last seventeen years, and tell me what reason you have to follow him? I have not said I am willing to have my sheep taxed, I have no sheep.

Mr. Gibson—What does His Excellency mean by these insinuations? Does he wish disorder? He will have it.

His Excellency the Minister of Interior—I am talking from the record. Hitherto I have handled the gentlemen with gloved hands. Were I to unroll his history to this people, I would make him shiver in his boots. What measure has he brought into the House causing him to be trusted? His visit to the leper settlement, at great expense, resulted in his suggesting the publication of a medical book as a compendium of health. If I were going to suggest a subject to the gentleman, I would suggest theology; he is able to write upon that. Dr. Judd who was a true friend of the Hawaiian people, was the first to make this suggestion—the idea is not original with Mr. Gibson—and advocated the education of Hawaiian youths, qualifying them to practice medicine, from pure love and philanthropic motives, not personal ambition. These frequent changes of the Ministry prevent the investment of capital to carry on the necessary improvements, and some day or other the Hawaiian people will rue it to their hearts' core. The opposition has not shown good and sufficient reasons for a change of the Ministry. At the late hour of 11 p.m. the Committee rose without coming to a vote on the resolution, and the Assembly adjourned till Monday at 10 a.m.

The session on Monday was mainly occupied with a continuance of the discussion of the resolution of want of confidence. The following is an abstract of the remarks of the Hon. Mr. Gibson, the mover of the resolution:

"When I brought forward this resolution of want of confidence, I reasonably expected some strength and heat of debate. But I was surprised and I feel assured that many others were surprised and pained at the exhibition of ungoverned temper and defective judgment by one of the Ministers on Friday night. I appeal to you, Mr. President, and to this Assembly to say whether I have in any instance swerved from the strictest decorum of debate. In my remarks sustaining the resolution I confined myself solely to particulars relating to official action, and pertinent to the question at issue.

But what have we from Ministers? We have an angry disjointed talk, instead of argument, and personal insinuations as the strength of their discussion—something of this I expected from the Attorney-General, as it is in consonance with his training and the school of thought in which he was brought up, to make up for any lack of ability in debate, by raking up something about an opponent's antecedents. But I did not expect this from the Minister of the Interior; he and I were pleasantly associated together during the latter part of the year 1869 in the city of Washington. He then represented Hawaii before the Great Republic. I assisted him a little in his official duties; and I now preserve many letters from him, and also from his chief in Honolulu, the then Minister for Foreign Affairs, and who is now the Chancellor of the Kingdom, in which my services and co-operation are spoken of in terms of high approval and warm commendation. And since then there has been no cessation of courteous intercourse between myself and the Minister until last Friday night.

It may be said that I broke off intercourse by my opposition to his ministerial course. I have seen elsewhere that political antagonism did not destroy personal relations amongst honorable men; but it has so affected this Minister.

He says he has handled me with gloves heretofore, but now he takes them off, and I must expect the full strength of his knuckles and all the fierceness of his claws. But I don't propose

to take mine off, as I think I can handle him without dirtying my hands or ruffling my costume. I have, it is true, unsheathed the sword for the battle of debate, but I don't propose to throw away the scabbard; because I came here not to represent myself or my feelings or interests, but the Hawaiian people. If the encounter is to be personal, the street and not the forum is the proper arena. Surely this Legislative Hall was not the proper place for such an exhibition of unseemly temper as we witnessed here on Friday night. What an example of the decorum of debate among foreigners for Hawaiian legislators! The Minister said if he would unravel my history I would shrink in my boots. Now, I don't think so. I think if all my vicissitudes of life were unfolded I should enlarge in consequence and require a larger pair. If my history was fully set forth by the Minister, and he should

Naught extenuate,
Nor set down aught in malice."

I sincerely believe it would be a very lucrative work, and make me much more popular than what I am. Whereas I don't believe his history would be worth the paper it was printed upon, unless his biographer should, like him, deal in the innuendos and insinuations of the streets, about personal relations.

He hints of so much that might be told about me from Kauai to Hawaii, and especially on Lanai. Yes, and all around this wide world, he could find particulars of a history—enriched by observation, enlarged by encounters with fellow-men, softened by fellow-suffering,—and never rendered hard or mean by the strife for gain or the struggle for position.

And the Hon. Attorney-General leads you to suppose, Mr. President, that a certain dead man, were he alive, could tell such a story about me, as "Would freeze your young blood, and make your hair stand on end like quills upon the fretful porcupine."

It is a pity that these legislators and this community have lost that story, because so many of the good people of these islands love a sensational story, whenever it is supposed to blacken or extinguish a reputation. But let their Excellencies defer the tales of others about me for some subsequent literary work at their leisure; whilst here in this Hall and as Representatives of the honor and dignity of a throne, let them deal with facts, and tell only what they know or what may be pertinent to the subject in hand. I defy them, as I have defied in years past in this country, assailants in other situations, to tell all they know about me—if they deem such discussion appropriate to the debate before this Assembly.

Ministers exalt me beyond measure—they magnify my position by charging me with being a misleader of the nation. They tell independent Hawaiian members, whom sometimes they flatter with opinions about their good sense and intelligence,—that now they have no minds of their own,—are mere sheep, and driven or led by me as their shepherd.

It is true, Mr. President, that I am a shepherd,—that and no more, and on the Lanai hills have watched my flocks, for, lo, these many years—till weary with the longings of an ardent heart, I came forth from the obscurity of years, and left my sheep in the wilderness, to look after my other flocks here. But His Excellency assured you, that he was not a sheep, nor of my flock.

No, sir, he is not; he is of another stock. I do not deal in animals of his kind. He belongs to that other stock, which shall be separated from the sheep; if not to-day, yet at some future day of political judgment in the Kingdom of Hawaii.

His Excellency deprecated the mischief that might be done by political agitation against the authorities of government, and he feared, as the Hon. member for Kohala feared, that foreign capital might be scared away by opposition to a Ministry. He has reason to know whether this would be the case or not. He has been noted as a political agitator in years past. He joined with others to oust Dr. Judd, who is supposed by many to be the best Minister of the Crown that Hawaii has ever had. His Excellency took part with an agitating political committee at another time, and here recently, only two short years ago, when he was Chairman of the Committee on Finance, he took part in an opposition against Ministers in 1876. He ought to know something about this kind of business; and now perhaps when he is in office he begins to appreciate the unrighteousness and injury to public interest, of opposition to the constituted authorities. Thus we get very different ideas of an object when we change our point of view. When Dr. J. Mott Smith tried to agitate the eminent Judd out of office, he felt that he was rendering Hawaii and the world a service, and had no fears about capital being scared; but when the position of His Excellency Minister Smith is assailed he feels that the best interests of the country are jeopardized by an intriguing and dangerous demagoguism. But let him beware, sir.

He has sown the winds of political agitation, and he must and will reap of the whirlwind of political reformation.

His Excellency was a political reformer himself in 1876. And I as Chairman of the Committee on Finance in 1878, am but repeating part of his work. He said then that \$20 improperly spent was not too small a sum to be considered as beneath the attention of an investigator of public accounts; and I and the Committee say now that \$323.60 actually lost, is still less to be considered as beneath the attention of this Legislative Assembly. He then reported that certain amounts for salaries of Judges which had not been drawn at the close of the biennial period in 1876, had been returned to the Treasury and had not been re-appropriated; whereas, I and my colleagues on the Committee have had to report unexpended balances as improperly drawn from the public Treasury, and which were not returned to it, till by the order of this Assembly. He had small occasion for agitating political reformation in 1876, whereas, I think, and many others think there is great occasion for such reform in 1878. There was no accusation nor even any suspicion of dishonesty against officers of government in

1876; and there is no accusation in 1878; but can any one read the report of the Commission of Experts which supplemented the work of the present Committee on Finance and not feel that there is ample room for suspicion? "No ground for accusation," says the report in reference to the Interior Department, "except in the Land Office," and there it would seem there is ground for suspicion and possibly of accusation too. But I indulge in no suspicions, and only call attention to the statement as expressed by three careful and deliberate men. No one has impugned the personal honesty of Ministers, and there has been a good deal of unnecessary vindication of character on that point. But their administration of office has been and is impugned. Nobody says they have stolen money; but that through careless or negligent management of public business in some instances, an opportunity has been afforded for pilferings or losses.

But if there had been no charge of any nature whatsoever against the Attorney-General or the Minister of the Interior, there would be sufficient in the character of their debate of last Friday night to furnish grounds for a resolution of want of confidence, not only against them as Ministers, but as orderly citizens. Then we listened to what appeared to be the harangue of a demagogue, rather than to the temperate appeal of a dignified upholder of the King, and of a conservator of the common weal. The old spirit of the political agitator blazed forth, and the man who had hounded the eminent Judd out of office, vociferated and bullied like one who was holding on to some ill-gotten spoil.

And all this outcry was against the member for Lahaina, because this member for Lahaina knows him, and all the influences that surround him, and he fears no issue that he or his associates choose to make.

His Excellency, and those of his party, represent a foreign sentiment here, that mocks at the hope of the nation. I have no doubt about Ministers being just in their dealings, faithful in their relations in life, and especially kind in their family intercourse; yet I say that they belong to that party of foreign opinion that has no hope for the Hawaiian people, but assumes that they must decline and utterly pass away. Our Honorable President justly remarked on Friday that our discussions of administration in the Departments, whether good or bad, were of minor consequence; that the greater question related to the spirit and purpose of the foreigners in authority in respect to the permanent independence of this Kingdom, and the perpetuity of the Hawaiian Nation. Their hope is in other lands and not here. They are transient; or, at least, only interested in the material progress of the country. They showed this when they strove to sell or cede a portion of Hawaiian territory. The men whom we oppose now, all except one, the native Hawaiian Minister, were interested in this scheme of cession. The man who was with them a while ago in the Cabinet, and whom they sent abroad, clothed with the highest honors, to represent this nation in Europe, was the especial champion of cession of Hawaiian territory. And when he advocated this measure in a carefully prepared speech, delivered at the Hawaiian Hotel in 1873, he also dwelt on the possibilities of annexation, and gave utterance to a belief "that annexation to the United States is the inevitable destiny of this country, owing to the diminution of the native race."

We know that the wish is the father to the thought. And men dwell much upon the possibilities of what they hope to see realized. And they talk of decline, because their hope is that way. But my hope, and the hope of the influence that I partly represent, is that the Hawaiian Nation will live; and our purpose is to care more for the life of the people than for material progress alone. The two must go together; and I feel assured that no measure that I would recommend or endorse will be calculated to alarm capital in the slightest degree; but if I should have to choose between some enterprise of internal improvement and the life or health of Hawaiians, be assured that I would not sacrifice one life for any measure of material progress.

And now we face each other: they who have no hope in their hearts for the future of this nation, and who will hope and strive even against despair. And you, Hawaiians, must choose in whom you will place your confidence. Will any of you sell the hope of his race for some paltry gain or hope of office? then let him forever have the malediction of his countrymen.

Now, whatever the issue of this contest, I trust there will be a beneficial change. Will it be believed, as charged, that my only object is office? Can a man of observation and years, and with an ardent and aspiring nature strive only for office, with its routine and its trammels? Can no one believe in the entertainment of a generous idea? I have reason to entertain one in respect to this nation and country. I trust I may be pardoned for reverting to comforts, and blessing, yea, even to the saving of life, at the hands of Hawaiians. And therefore, I am proud and happy to speak for them, and what I regard as their best welfare.

I hardly think I care so much about the issue of this resolution as the Ministers. We have the evidence before us of their extraordinary efforts. They dispatched a steamer to bring here one of the Nobles, who, perhaps, preferred the comforts of home. And here we behold our sick friend, he, with whom I have had such pleasant associations in Lahaina, carried in here for this occasion alone, to vote against us. I would be glad to see him often here in health and strength, and not for this occasion alone to support a quaking Ministry. Their alarm must have been great, but their determination to hold on to office is still greater, when they resolve to vote for themselves. In any other Parliament in the world I feel assured that a sense of honor would induce Ministers to retire on such an occasion.

But they will not. They will strive to hold their positions, in spite of any adverse sentiment that would induce others to retire; and the issue is with you, Hawaiian Representatives. Whatever the result I shall strive to do my duty in advancing public business and in serving the best interests of Hawaii.